

which cannot be concluded without extending the initial deadlines set forth in the Scheduling Order. Highlights of these efforts are below:

- March 27, 2017: FFRF requested dates for the depositions of Abbott and Sneed.
- April 3, 2017: Defendants' counsel promises a substantive response on available dates after she consults with Defendants.
- April 6, 2017: After being prompted again, Defendants' counsel argues that Abbott and Sneed are not be subject to being deposed because they were high-ranking government officials. That same day, FFRF's counsel urged Defendants to reconsider based on Sneed's and Abbott's personal involvement in the events underlying this dispute. Defendants do not respond.
- April 10, 2017: FFRF issues notices for the depositions of Sneed and Abbott to occur on April 24 and 25, 2017, respectively.
- April 13, 2017: Defendants' counsel alleges for the first time that Abbott did not play a role in either deciding to remove the display or drafting and signing his letter, but rather claims that those actions were taken by unnamed members of his staff. Instead of identifying those staff members, Defendants' counsel indicated they would only reveal this information through formal written discovery.¹
- April 14, 2017: FFRF confirms its intent to go forward with the Sneed and Abbott depositions and requests information regarding Abbott's supposed ghost writer.
- April 17, 2017: Defendants' counsel confirms that they will file motions seeking to prevent the depositions of Abbott and Sneed, and does so for Abbott that day. The purported ghost writer remains unidentified.
- April 18, 2017: Defendants' counsel complains that Sneed is a non-party for which a subpoena must be issued. FFRF issues a subpoena for Sneed to appear at his deposition.
- April 20, 2017: Sneed files a motion to quash the subpoena issued for his deposition.

¹ Based on their answer in this action, FFRF is skeptical that Defendants would be forthcoming in response to written discovery. For example, Defendants stated that they lacked knowledge sufficient to form a belief about the truth of FFRF's allegations about a "tweet" authored by Abbott. *See* Defendants' Original Answer to First Amended Complaint [Dkt. 29], at ¶ 85. That paragraph alleged, "In a social media message, a December 22 "tweet," the Governor referred to FFRF's display as offensive and the Governor boasted that he had demanded removal of the FFRF display from the Capitol." First Amended Complaint [Dkt. 15], at ¶ 85.

III. DISCUSSION

3. Good cause exists for the modest extensions requested by FFRF. The trial of this matter will be over a year after the requested extension of the Discovery Cutoff. There is no docket-related reason to compress the discovery process, and Defendants' actions have thwarted discovery efforts thus far.

4. FFRF has been diligent in its efforts to complete discovery prior to the expiration of the initial deadline, but its efforts have been resisted by Defendants. FFRF began requesting available deposition dates from Defendants in March, over sixty days before the initial Discovery Cutoff. Defendants seek to prevent these depositions from occurring at all, despite the intended deponents' intimate personal involvement in the underlying transactions and occurrences. Despite Abbott's signature on the letter ordering the display's removal and Sneed's actions to remove it, Defendants now claim that neither of them may be deposed, at least not until alternate discovery tools have been exhausted. Both Defendants have filed motions [Dkt. 41 & 42] asking this Court to first require FFRF to engage in other time-consuming discovery methods to determine if others have deeper knowledge of and are responsible for the actions at issue in this lawsuit. Defendants have also protracted the discovery process by insisting that the longer lead times necessary for deposing third parties be applied to Sneed on the grounds that he is no longer in office (while at the same time seeking to prevent his deposition from proceeding on the ground that he is entitled to protections as a high-ranking governmental official). Without that discovery, FFRF cannot determine whether it is necessary to amend its pleadings or add any parties. Whether intended or not, Defendants' actions will have the effects of allowing these deadlines to expire and preventing FFRF from obtaining the discovery to which it is entitled.

5. Defendants' dilatory tactics should not be rewarded by prematurely foreclosing discovery. To be afforded due process, FFRF must be allowed to fully discover Abbott's and

Sneed's knowledge of the events leading up to this dispute in the context of a deposition, as well as the identity of any other individuals that may have been involved. Barring further discovery obstructions, a sixty day extension of the Pleadings and Parties Deadline and the Discovery Cutoff should be sufficient to allow FFRF to fairly prepare for trial.

IV. CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

6. Counsel for FFRF has conferred with counsel for Defendants who confirmed that Defendants are opposed to the relief requested by this motion.

V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff Freedom From Religion Foundation, Inc. requests this Court amend the Scheduling Order to extend the period to file all amended or supplemental pleadings and join additional parties from April 27, 2017 to June 26, 2017, and to extend the discovery period from May 26, 2017 to July 25, 2017.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Freedom From Religion Foundation, Inc. requests that the Court grant this motion to amend the Scheduling Order and grant FFRF such other and further relief to which it is justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

FRITZ, BYRNE, HEAD & GILSTRAP, PLLC
221 West 6th Street, Suite 960
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: 512-476-2020
Telecopier: 512-477-5267

BY: /s/ Daniel H. Byrne
Daniel H. Byrne
Texas State Bar No. 03565600
Email: dbyrne@fbhf.com
Lessie G. Fitzpatrick
Texas State Bar No. 24012630
Email: lfitzpatrick@fbhf.com

Richard L. Bolton
Wisconsin State Bar No. 1012552
Email: rbolton@boardmanclark.com
BOARDMAN AND CLARK, LLP
1 S. Pinckney St., Suite 410
Madison, Wisconsin 53703-4256
Telephone: 608-257-9521
Telecopier: 608-283-1709
Sam Grover
Wisconsin State Bar No. 1096047
Email: sgrover@ffrf.org
Patrick Elliott
Wisconsin State Bar No. 1074300
Email: pelliott@ffrf.org

FREEDOM FROM RELIGION FOUNDATION, INC.
P. O. Box 750
Madison, Wisconsin 53701
Telephone: 608-256-8900
Telecopier: 608-204-0422

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF FREEDOM
FROM RELIGION FOUNDATION, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was filed electronically via the Court's CM/ECF system on this the 28th day of April, 2016, which will send notification to the following:

Anna Marie Mackin
Austin R. Nimocks
Brantley Starr
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78701
Telephone: (512) 475-4080
Telecopier: (512) 320-0667
Email: Anna.mackin@texasattorneygeneral.gov
Email: Austin.nimocks@texasattorneygeneral.gov
Email: Brantley.starr@texasattorneygeneral.gov

/s/ Daniel H. Byrne
Daniel H. Byrne